

🏠 **Location:** WEBEX
📅 **Date:** December 16, 2020
🕒 **Time:** 8:30am

Commissioners Present: Steve Wittmann (Chair), Otto Beatty (Vice-Chair) Commissioners, Robert Loversidge, Jana Maniace, Tedd Hardesty, Tony Slanec, Mike Lusk, Danni Palmore

Absent: N/A

Staff Present: Luis Teba, Nolan Harshaw

Call to Order (8:33)

- Swear in Staff
- Introduction of Commissioners
- Overview of Hearing Format
- Public Forum

A. Approval of Minutes from Last Meeting

DISCUSSION: N/A

MOTION: To approve the minutes as presented

MOTION BY: Beatty/Palmore (8-0-0) APPROVED.

B. Continued Applications

1) **DC_20-10-007**

305 West Nationwide Boulevard

Putnam Hill Company LLC / DaNite Sign Company

Request for Action

Graphics

Modification of an existing rooftop sign and installation of two wall signs.

Discussion:

Rex Elliot and Jennifer Bender presented.

- Loversidge stated that the sign on top is ok. It's not as creative, and I might have a concern of too much signage, but it's in the arena district, where chaotic signage is ok. I prefer the white wall signs.
- Elliot agreed.
- Wittmann stated that the rooftop sign is much better because you have compressed the letters. It isn't as bold. I would like the southern sign to match the northern sign.
- Maniace stated that she agreed that it should match the northern sign. I am fine with it being higher.
- Lusk stated he agreed as well.
- Palmore asked if the south facing sign should be option A or B.
- Wittmann stated that he thought it should match and be lowered.
- Loversidge added that it should match the top of the windows. They should relate it to the canopy.
- Elliot said he was fine with that.

Motion: To approve option B, with the south facing sign to match the north facing sign in scale, and drop it down to the level of the canopy.

Motion by: Loversidge/Palmore (8-0-0) APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS

C. New applications

2) **DC_20-12-002**

535 Reach Boulevard

WC Goodale OB2, LLC / Stanley W Young III, Branham Sign Co.

Request for Action

Graphics

Installation of a graphics package.

Discussion:

Tom Brahnham, Jerry Coltenbach, and George Janco presented.

Motion: To approve the proposal as presented

Motion by: Lusk/Maniace (8-0-0) APPROVED.

3) **DC_20-12-004**

116-124 East Long Street

JLP 116-124 East Long Street LLC / JLP 116-124 East Long Street LLC

Request for Action

Graphics

New ad-mural location.

Discussion:

Bob McCullum and Dirk Greene presented

- Palmore asked how long the sign will be up.
- Greene replied about 2-3 months, but then they will do third party advertisers.
- Maniace said she felt the mural really dominates the streetscape. It somehow diminishes the other buildings, and she is concerned about this as a new location.
- Loversidge said he agreed that it was too big. It is on a secondary building façade, but there is nothing creative about it and it is offensive.
- Wittmann replied that we have no say over content.
- Loversidge stated that we have completely lost control over what was intended to be a creative solution downtown.
- Palmore asked if the arrow was supposed to match the building.
- Greene replied that it was supposed to match the @150 color scheme.
- Loversidge said he would like the bottom of the sign to align with the bottom of the strip on the front of the building so it relates to the building and doesn't look like a billboard.
- Wittmann stated that we do not have to approve the sign if we don't want to.
- Lusk asked if this location meets the locational criteria.
- Teba said it does meet the basic criteria, but the Commission has the leeway to evaluate it and turn it down if they choose.
- Maniace asked if it was because they reviewed it based on context as well.
- Teba replied that was correct.
- Beatty asked if the owner would be willing to make modifications to get the sign approved.
- Greene said they would.
- Beatty asked if this would help approve the sign.
- Wittmann, Slanek, Hardesty said they were a no vote.
- Greene asked what recourse he had moving forward.
- Loversidge replied that he could appeal.

Motion: To approve the sign location with the following conditions:

- **The bottom of the sign aligns with the white strip across the front, subject to this being a new location for an ad-mural.**

Motion by: Loversidge / Lusk (0-8-0) DENIED.

- 4) **DC_20-12-011**
154 North Third Street
Third & Lafayette SSR II LLC / John Ingwersen
Request for Action
Exterior Building Alteration
Inset previously approved storefront 10' into building.
Discussion:
John Ingwersen presented.
- Maniace said she was wondering if the recessed lighting was going to be decorative to make it more of a street presence. Maybe a flush mount decorative light with a low partial wall or planter wall to define the edge.
 - Wittmann said they could approve it and have them return with signage and lighting.
- Motion: To approve the proposal with the following conditions:**
- **The applicant return with lighting and signage.**
- Motion by: Slanek / Palmore (8-0-0) APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS**
- 5) **DC_20-12-012**
66-68 North High Street
Eclipse Real Estate Group / Meyers + Associates Architects
Request for Action
Exterior Building Alteration
Renovation of ground floor storefront and outdoor dining patio.
Discussion:
Chris Meyers and Mike Burmeister presented
Motion: To approve the proposal as presented
Motion by: Maniace/Palmore (7-1-0) APPROVED. [Hardesty Recused]
- 6) **DC_20-12-013**
201 South High Street
199 High Partners LLC / LKLastdance LLC
Request for Action
Ext. Bldg. Alt. / Graphics
Modification of existing storefront to include french doors.
Discussion:
Lori Ames presented
- Ames stated that they had modified the awning to be 42"x42".
 - Loversidge said he wasn't too excited about having a multi-light window on the front of this building.
 - Maniace asked if the single glass door was wood aluminum.
 - Ames said it was a wood door.
 - Wittmann asked if anyone preferred the single light.
 - Maniace, Ames, and Loversidge said they preferred the single light.
 - Ames said the awning would be about a foot below the existing light, and extend out about 42".
- Motion: To approve the proposal with the following conditions:**
- **The doors will be single light.**
 - **The awning be staff approved and measure 42"x42"**
- Motion by: Hardesty/Palmore (8-0-0) APPROVED. [Hardesty Recused]**

D. Conceptual Applications

1) DC_20-12-015

Confluence Village

Confluence Development LLC / Jon Riewald

Conceptual review

New Construction

Construction of an office building and two residential buildings.

Discussion:

Jon Riewald, Dan Gore, Jeff Pangonis, Sam Luckino, and John Glessing presented.

- Loversidge asked if they anticipated changing traffic circulation on game days.
- Glessing replied that traffic circulation will be limited on game days to east of the train tracks.
- Maniace asked if the garage will also service game day parking.
- Glessing answered that there will be limited game day parking at the garage.
- Loversidge said he liked the terraces and wondered if the slabs shouldn't match the angular nature of the windows.
- Wittmann said he actually liked the straight line.
- Gore said that the straight slab looks very nice from the interior.
- Wittmann said that he thought the office building was very exciting. He asked about the large change in grade.
- Gore said there is about 8 feet of grade change.
- Luckino said that they will be using planter beds and stairs to create cascading greenery that wraps around the building to deal with the grade change.
- Maniace stated that the façade of the parking garage facing the interior space in Block A would be critical, and that perhaps the parking lot in Block B could be improved with brick, or a median, or something to make it a bit more park-like and visually interesting.
- Luckino said that the facades of the parking garage was critical on how it would affect their open space, and they are working with Moody Nolan.
- Wittmann asked what the schedule was for the buildings. What would be built first?
- Luckino said that residential Block A would probably go first, unless there was an office tenant ready to move in.
- Gore stated that the northern parking lot is below the freeway, and there is a large grade change.
- Wittman stated that he was more concerned about the view for the units. Have they considered covered parking with a green roof?
- Gore replied that they have, but they have a diverse mix of units and affordability, so they want to be mindful of the cost.
- Riewald said that they may be able to improve that parking lot moving forward by removing a drive aisle.
- Loversidge asked if the distance buildings between A and B was close enough.
- Luckino said the distance between the buildings was 85 feet. There will be parallel parking, and street trees that should reduce the feel of the distance between the buildings.
- Gore said that the landscape architecture to west side of residential building B is viewed as an extension of the park, and they will return in the spring.
- Maniace asked if there was a way to incorporate a green roof on the one story lobby areas. She also asked if the building walls were angular in the float design.
- Luckino said that yes they would be angular to break up the static façade.
- Wittmann asked if they would like to return for another conceptual review.
- Gore stated that they would like to return for another conceptual review on the residential, but would like a conceptual review approval on the office building.
- Loversidge and Hardesty said they thought the office building was great.

- Loversidge said we don't approve conceptual design, however, the comments at this meeting were positive.

Motion: N/A

Motion by: N/A

2) **DC_20-12-016**

195-209 East Broad Street

Edwards Communities / Nataliya Yedidovich

Conceptual Review

New Construction / Demolition

Demolition of three existing structures and construction of a 13 story mixed-use structure.

Discussion:

Bryce Hall and Jeff Edwards presented.

Becky West was a member of the public who spoke.

- Maniace stated she felt the building was a very handsome building. She likes the banding on the building and it mimics the WCOL building. Could it be incorporated into the new building? It is historically and culturally significant. It seems it could cover the building. Is there any flexibility with the parking garage to retain more of that structure?
- Edwards stated that he prides himself with historic preservation. The Gilbert building and the WCOL building were not economically feasible to make those buildings work. We could consider trying to reuse more of those buildings. The garage footprint is dictated by the need to have two parking bays. The PNC tower is under parked. We own the walkway and the tower, but not the parking garage. I was very uncomfortable investing in the PNC tower without having additional parking. We purchased these properties, and the garage will service both buildings. We could add the façade to the WCOL building, but I'm not sure it would be a bit contrived.
- Wittmann asked if there was any possibility of using the second floor along Broad Street. It would help enliven the street.
- Hall said it would mess up the parking. Unfortunately, if you do that, you sort of kill it. At the Corner of Broad and Young, we have carved out two stories. We may activate that with a sculptural piece, or decorative lighting in that space. There will not be an actual use on that second floor and it will only screen the parking.
- Wittmann stated that perhaps the corner could appear to be its own building. I really like that the lobby is there.
- Edwards added that the plan for the second floor of the saved façade was to incorporate the existing french doors.
- Loversidge stated that the scale of the building seems ok. The two story limestone piece is the most handsome and useable piece, but it seems awfully pasted on. Perhaps it could be more three dimensional and turn the corner. I don't see anything good between the second floor and the first floor of the residential. You have a sophisticated design on the residential. I can live with the fins. I don't understand the black brick with black mortar, and it doesn't work well with the glass corner. I would like to see the limestone façade emphasized with some depth, something cool with the corner, and something different with the space between. I don't think a giant black building is a great idea.
- Slanek said he would like to see something incorporated at the street level on Young to make it seem like you aren't just moving down a tunnel.
- Beatty asked why the building was all black.
- Edwards stated that he was guilty of that on the upper floors. In Manhattan you see spectacular buildings. It is similar to a building you see there on the Highline which is attractive. The lower floors can be reworked.
- Hall said that when you have a dark color on the top, you usually wants to have a darker color on the base. It allows the existing façade to be an accent. We could reconsider that color pallet.

- Maniace said that keeping it dark is ok, but the contrast between the dark and the preserved façade should not be so drastic.
- Edwards stated that he saw a darker brick in Dallas that was similar. It had darker brick and dark mortar.
- Wittmann stated that the effect of the glass on the building may mitigate the dark. I really don't have any issues with any of this, but I think the area above the stone façade was odd.
- Maniace asked if there was an opportunity for more glass on the corner of the first floors. Perhaps the WCOL building elements could be incorporated into a lobby area or something in that vein.
- West stated that Columbus Landmarks considered these buildings on their list of most endangered buildings five years ago. She stated there are many acres of surface parking lots. Edwards has experience in redevelopment surface lots. They would prefer to see this building on a surface lot. Preserving these buildings is environmental, and preserving a façade is a nod to their high quality, but it is not historic preservation.
- Edwards stated that he wanted to make sure he understood what they were charged with. The older façade should not look like it is pasted on. It should turn the corner.
- Hall added that they should look at the pedestrian experience along Young Street.
- Loversidge said they should document the WCOL building if it does come down.

Motion: N/A

Motion by: N/A

E. Staff Approved Applications

The following applications were entered into the formal record.

- 1) **DC_20-12-003**
550 West Nationwide Boulevard
Crew SC Stadium Company LLC / Crew SC Stadium Company LLC
Wall Sign
- 2) **DC_20-12-005**
237 Cleveland Avenue
Xiam Honda / Xiam Honda
Mechanical Equipment
- 3) **DC_20-12-006**
237 Cleveland Avenue
Todd Johnson / Oliver Holtsberry
Wall Sign
- 4) **DC_20-12-007**
77 East Gay Street
DJ Real Estate / Stan Young
Awning / Projecting Sign
- 5) **DC_20-12-008**
85 East Gay Street
AT&T / Jerry Johnson
Antennas
- 6) **DC_20-12-017**
123 East Spring Street
Spring Street LLC / Pamela Meeks
Projecting Sign Refacing

Motion: To enter the staff approved applications into the formal record.

Motion by: Loversidge / Maniace (8-0-0)

F. New Business

- 1) N/A

G. Old Business

- 1) N/A

H. Adjournment 11:30am

Applicants or their representatives must attend this hearing, for new and continued applications for Certificates of Appropriateness. If applicants are absent it is likely that the application will be continued until the Commission's next hearing. Meeting Accommodations: It is the policy of the City of Columbus that all City-sponsored public meetings and events are accessible to people with disabilities. If you need assistance in participating in this meeting or event due to a disability as defined under the ADA, please call the City's ADA Coordinator at (614) 645-8871, or email zdjones@columbus.gov, at least three (3) business days prior to the scheduled meeting or event to request an accommodation.